LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

Editor: R. Palme Dutt

Dangers of Delay
R.P.D.

Challenge to Britain
J. B. FIGGINS

Beasts Gone Mad
JEAN-PAUL SARTRE

August, 1953

One shilling and sixpence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OPENING EYES

MARK TWAIN in 1901 denounced what he described as 'The United States of Lyncherdom'. He feared that he might yet live to see a lynching in New York, with 'not a sheriff visible, not a governor, not a constable, not a colonel, not a clergyman, not a law-and-order representative of any sort'. Some 50 years later there was indeed a lynching there, but with all those characters present; for it was a lynching carried out by law-and-order itself. In June, 1953, there were those who, to ensure that the victims should not escape, did not stick at attempting to overthrow the Constitution by threats of violence, striking direct blows at one of the supposed cardinal principles of that Constitution—the independence of the judiciary. An American reader comments: 'Today—with honourable exceptions—a judge sitting on cases of this nature is no longer his own man. A miasma of fear has infected bench, bar and jury, with an austere judicial robe chastely hiding quaking knees and quailing heart . . . abject, panic surrender to the debased forces which seek to rob us of all human dignity and drive us like a pack of maddened Gadarene swine into a sea of immeasurable disaster'. There is a name for them, these debased forces, who burn the books of American democrats (Mark Twain's among them) and burn their bodies too, who seek to cover their own crimes by charging teachers of Marxism with advocating the overthrow by violence of the Government. Their true name was given to them 20 years ago by Dimitrov, just after he had magnificently exposed the Reichstag Fire plot of Hitler, Goebbels and Goering—and in doing so taught millions to recognise the face of fascism. Dimitrov pointed to 'the beginnings of real fascism in the United States behind the hypocritical outpourings of these circles in "defence of the democratic rights" of the American citizens'. He warned then: 'American Fascism tries to portray itself as the custodian of the Constitution and "American Democracy" '. Indeed, each crime against the peoples of the world opens the eyes of millions more. Of the victims of today our American reader writes: 'It is not finished. It has just begun. In the quality of their lives and the manner of their going they have left us the legacy of a solemn, inescapable obligation to fight for their vindication'. The American poet, Stephen Vincent Benet, described in *John Brown's Body* that truly American figure and his fellow fighters against slavery, whose soul goes marching on:

'And an immortal anguish plucks us up,
And will not hide us till our song is done.'

In this number, Jean-Paul Sartre writes that America, sick with fear, becomes 'the cradle of a new fascism'.

These are challenging times, with time and tide running fast. An appropriate moment for this *Challenge to Britain*, the stirring article by J. B. Figgins, the railwaymen's veteran leader, on page 350. His view of the official programme to come before this year's Labour Party conference seems to be shared by many, judging by letters which have been reaching us from active folk in the Labour Party. A former councillor thinks it 'seems to be more of a Conservative programme than an answer to the inspiring progressive ideals of last year's conference—as indicated from the floor, but

(Continued on page iii of cover)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXXV, No. 8

CONTENTS

August, 1953

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: Dangers of Delay, by R.P.D.	337
CHALLENGE TO BRITAIN, by J. B. Figgins	350
A VETERAN'S VOICE FOR PEACE, by Florence Mattison	354
BEASTS GONE MAD, by Jean-Paul Sartre	358
OLD FALLACIES FOR NEW, by Andrew Rothstein	364
ITALY, by J. Platts-Mills	372
TWO HEALTH SERVICES, by Dr. Amrit Kaur	375
"THE EMPIRE", by William Gallacher	377
TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO	376
ILLUSTRATIONS: *Drawings of Greece Today*, by Paul Hogarth	360-361
Book Reviews:	
China Stands Up, by R. K. Karanjia: *V. Penn*	381
Russia's Lomonosov, by B. N. Menshutkin: *E. H. S. Burhop*	381
Defiant People, by Paul Hogarth: *R. T. F. Turner*	382
Shorter Notices	383

Notes of the Month

Dangers of Delay

'Delays have dangerous ends.'

SHAKESPEARE.

AUGUST, once the traditional month of holidays, has long become the traditional month of strain and stress and menacing explosion in the international situation. The memories of that sultry August close on four decades ago, when an era ended and late capitalism passed into that general crisis which still continues, and when international socialism entered on its supreme and ultimately triumphant test, are not forgotten and still bear their harvest in the world we have inherited today. Yet closer are the memories of that uneasy, event-filled and menacing August of fourteen years ago which ushered in the second world war. As late as August 3, Sir Thomas Inskip was declaring for the Government: 'War is unlikely—and the Government has very good reasons for saying that'. As late as August 9, the *News-Chronicle* was proclaiming 'Well Done!' 'Congratulations, Mr. Strang' on the return of the Strang Mission from Moscow—when in fact that Mission, osten-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sibly sent to negotiate the indispensable alliance with the Soviet Union, had in reality been sent, with limitless delays and with no effective powers, in order to sabotage the negotiations and prevent the alliance. Universal popular revulsion against Munich and demand for negotiations with the Soviet Union had compelled the Government to make a show of bowing to the storm and entering on such negotiations, and had thereby raised high the hopes of peace during that fateful spring and summer. But in reality the ruling representatives of Munich and enemies of the Soviet Union only made a show of such negotiations and turned down the reasonable proposals of the Soviet Union for an effective reciprocal alliance which could alone have ensured peace. Hence war became inevitable.

After Washington

There is a lesson in that experience for today. Once again popular revulsion in Europe is running high against the new Axis of the American War Alliance, and compelling the Governments to make a turn and propose negotiations with the Soviet Union. Once again the enemies of peace, the champions of anti-Soviet hatred and war incitement, are busy to block the road, to hinder or sabotage negotiations, and stir up incidents from Korea to Berlin. The forces of peace are today many times stronger than fourteen years ago, and there is every ground for confidence in their full capacity to win the aim of peace. But delay is dangerous. Already the original Churchill proposal for a top-level conference of the Powers petered downwards to Bermuda. Bermuda petered downwards to Washington. Washington has replaced the Churchill proposal by its opposite. In place of the Churchill proposal for a conference of Heads of States with full authority, 'not overhung by a rigid agenda', and with 'informality' and 'privacy' to range over all issues in order to reach a general settlement, the Washington decisions have proposed a limited lower level conference with a rigid agenda confined to the issues of German elections and Austria, to take place after the West German elections and under the stultifying condition of American prior insistence on the integration of Western Germany in the Atlantic military bloc. Such a proposal is equivalent to a repudiation of the Churchill plan. But the Washington capitulation of Salisbury and Bidault cannot end the matter. The need for the top-level meeting of the powers is greater than ever. It is essential to press forward the fight for this aim.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How Long?

Over four months, one third of a year, have passed since the Soviet peace initiative of March. Over two months have passed since the speeches of Sir Winston Churchill on May 11 and Mr. Attlee on May 12, which marked the first beginning of the turn in British policy, the direct response to the Soviet peace initiative and the public call, in defiance of the displeasure of the United States, for 'a conference on the highest level between the leading powers *without long delay*'. Since then what has happened? Throughout the world popular opinion has rallied to this British lead. All the countries and governments of Europe and Asia, with the exception of such subsidised American puppets as Rhee and Adenauer, have ranged themselves alongside Britain's proposals. The American war camp in panic has let loose every provocation to hinder peace and inflame the situation, and has exercised every threat and pressure upon its recalcitrant allies to bring them to heel.

Operation 'Obstruction'

The wrecking actions of the dictator Rhee, who could not last a day without American finance, arms and supplies, have been allowed to hold up intolerably the cease-fire in Korea. In Eastern Europe all the mechanism of violence and subversion, built up with limitless dollars, has been brought into premature action because of the fear of peaceful negotiations. Nevertheless, despite all the reckless press campaign of flagrant lies (and faked photographs of police violence in Western Germany labelled 'Eastern Germany') to create a mythical picture of regimes in dissolution, with whom negotiation would be unnecessary, the net effect has revealed the essential inefficacy and fiasco of this mechanism. At the same time, the wise policy of the governments in Eastern Europe, initiated before and continued *in spite of* (not because of) the American provocation, is consolidating the social and political basis of democracy, reaping the economic gains from previous effort, and correcting in time every point of weakness. The corresponding democratic strengthening in the Soviet Union, with the removal of Beria and correction of police violations of Soviet democracy, is powerfully reinforcing the camp of peace. But on the diplomatic front American obstruction has been able to hold up the moves for negotiations and postpone into a still indefinite future the proposed top-level conference of the powers for peace, which is universally demanded by all the governments concerned except the United States, and by world popular

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opinion. The weakening of the British initiative, through the illness of the Premier and other Ministers and consequent partial paralysis of government, and the inaction of labour leadership on top during these critical weeks since May, has played into the hands of the American obstructors. This is a serious situation.

Obstruction in Korea

Characteristic of the American strategy of obstruction of peace has been the role of Rhee in Korea. The system of simultaneous official disavowal and practical support and connivance repeats the tactics of the initiation of the war in June, 1950. It will be recalled that at that critical moment for war or peace, following the fiasco of the American intervention in China, Dulles, Bradley, Johnson and MacArthur on the spot gave the green light to Rhee to go ahead with his loudly proclaimed 'Offensive to the North', the collapse of Rhee immediately followed as the entire people rallied to the Korean People's Republic, and the planned American invasion of Korea could begin as the supposed response of the knight in armour to the 'victim of aggression'. So today, after the thousand successive pretexts put forward by the Americans to drag out the truce negotiations have reached exhaustion with the removal of every pretext for refusal by the infinite patience and concessions of the Korean and Chinese negotiators, once again Rhee is brought into play as the catspaw to stir up the dying embers of discord for the prolongation of the war. When the last remaining point of issue concerning the prisoners of war had been settled, and panic fear arose in the American and Rhee camp that the terrible truth about the prisoners supposed to be 'resisting repatriation' would be told from the lips of the tortured survivors to genuine neutrals, Rhee performs the manœuvre of seizing and placing in 'secret' detention the prisoners concerned, while the American Military Command professes to be incapable of interfering and unable even to 'find' the seized men—although the victims are being paraded in lorry loads before their eyes in the streets of Pusan.

Double Strategy

It is sufficiently obvious that American Intelligence could no more have been uninformed of these actions or the preparations for them than in June, 1950; and indeed Rhee gave the game away when

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his Acting Premier stated in his letter to General Clark that the only reason for not officially informing him was to enable the American Command to profess official ignorance ('even to be consulted about our contemplated action would have been unbearably embarrassing to you'). The Rhee-Robertson conversations and their sequel have further illustrated this double strategy. Rhee's conviction that peace would mean the end of his hated regime ('Mr. Rhee's personal conviction that, once an armistice was signed, it would mean the end of the Republic of Korea', according to the statement of a member of his national defence committee to *The Times* on July 8), and consequent tactics 'to take all the blame for blocking an armistice, thus making it politically possible for the United Nations to continue the war in Korea' (from the same statement) coincide with the aims of the most aggressive American militarists and expansionists who seek to extend the war in the Far East. Under these circumstances the indispensable armistice in Korea is still, up to the time of writing, in the balance; and the danger of new incidents and provocations, even if an armistice were signed, to renew or extend hostilities remains grave.

From Bermuda to Washington

No less serious is the action taken to hold up and delay a top-level meeting of the Powers, even when such a meeting has been publicly demanded by the governments of all the leading Powers concerned, with the sole exception of the United States. If ever there was a case of a one-sided and undesirable *veto*, such an example has been shown here—not a veto against war or illegal actions, but a veto against peace. 'Eisenhower Says No' has become the new theme song of the international situation. When Churchill proposed a meeting of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union 'without long delay', Eisenhower countered by proposing an exclusive meeting of the Western Powers at Bermuda, ostensibly in order to 'smoothe out differences' and ensure a 'common front' in any dealings with the Soviet Union—in other words, to defeat the rebellion of the dependent allies, impose the American line and insist on the customary Western ganging up against the Soviet Union in place of genuine negotiation. Churchill in turn countered Eisenhower by announcing Bermuda as a preparatory step to the wider conference with the Soviet Union. This was the exact contrary of the intention of the United States, which had proposed

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bermuda in order to kill the move for negotiations with the Soviet Union; and official repudiations of Churchill's statement as incorrect and unauthorised were immediately issued from Washington. But it was Churchill's statement which caught the ear of the world and centred widespread popular hopes on Bermuda as a step to negotiations with the Soviet Union and to peace. Thereupon Eisenhower set himself to hedge in Bermuda with a barbed wire fence of prior restrictions by his pledge in advance to Adenauer with regard to the proceedings of the conference as well as his assurances to Congress. It was at this point that the illness of Churchill prevented his going to Bermuda; Eisenhower sought to counter this by proposing to come to London to seek him out; the immediate outcome was the temporary substitute of the meeting of the Western Foreign Ministers at Washington.

Washington Contradictions

It is obvious that Washington could provide no substitute for Bermuda, just as Bermuda could provide no substitute for the indispensable top-level conference with the Soviet Union. The direct conflict of policy between the Western European Powers and the United States with regard to the crucial question of negotiations with the Soviet Union, that is, with regard to the crucial question of peace or war—a conflict which itself reflected and was further exacerbated by all the economic and other differences and grievances—could not be smoothed out or exorcised by a meeting of Salisbury, Dulles and Bidault. Whatever the formulas that might be reached to endeavour to paper over divisions, the direct collision in the essential approach was already unmistakable and public. Churchill had declared on May 21 that his 'main hope' in relation to the proposed Anglo-French-American meeting at Bermuda was that it should 'take a definite step forward to a meeting of far greater import'. Dulles declared on June 30 that 'one of the major tasks' of the meeting at Washington would be to 'exploit' the 'disruptive tendencies beginning to get under way' in Eastern Europe. Not much room for conciliation between these two approaches. But Salisbury is no Churchill. Not without reason the American press recalled with satisfaction his speech of opposition to the recognition of China. In such a secondary conference at a lower level Dulles could play the overlord, and the American impress could be the more easily applied. The outcome of Washington has shown that such in fact was the case.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Capitulation

The results of the Washington Conference of Foreign Ministers bear no relation to the hopes aroused by the Premier's speech of May for a meeting of Heads of States to reach a general settlement, or even to the hopes that became fixed on Bermuda. No sooner were the results announced than the entire reactionary press, especially in the United States, gleefully proclaimed that the Churchill project of a top-level conference was now dead, and that even the project of Bermuda could also be regarded as dead. It is evident that the heaviest United States pressure was exercised on the representatives of Britain and France. A sign of such pressure already before the final declaration was revealed in the agreement announced to maintain the indefensible embargoes on trade with China even after an armistice with Korea—a body blow against Britain's economic interests. The Conference declaration on the Far East is filled with bellicose threats; goes out of its way to congratulate Rhee without even a hint of criticism; envisages renewed hostilities in Korea even in the event of an armistice; calls for intensification of the war against Vietnam; and maintains the refusal of recognition of China's rightful place in the United Nations. The Conference declaration on Europe places in the forefront the ratification of the war plans to rearm Western Germany and integrate it in the Atlantic military bloc under American domination. Only on this basis is the proposal made, not for a top-level conference with the Soviet Union on wider issues, but for a conference of Foreign Ministers confined to the issues of German elections and Austria. The date of this Conference is proposed to fall 'in the autumn',—i.e. after the West German elections on September 6, in order that this show of an offer could serve as an electioneering convenience for Adenauer, with whom the plan was concocted. Thus the proposal to confer at a lower level and on a limited field is made in the most deliberately unpromising and provocative form. These decisions bear the stamp of American policy and represent a blow against Britain. But the battle is not finished. The deepening basic division of policy cannot be so easily abolished by these Washington decisions. The fight for Britain's independence of policy and for a joint meeting with the Soviet Union can and must go forward.

Time Slips By

Meanwhile opportunity slips by. With justice the *Manchester Guardian* warned on June 29:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> More serious is the danger that time is passing by, and that with the postponement of the meeting the chance of eventually negotiating with the Russians may slip through the fingers of the West.

This is the crux of the problem. Repeated reports have appeared in the American press that the possibility of a British-Soviet meeting without the participation of the United States has been considered and discussed on the highest levels in Britain. Thus Drew Pearson, under the heading 'Churchill, Malenkov May Confer', wrote in the *Washington Post* on June 15:

> Prime Minister Nehru of India in a private conversation with Churchill had staged a bitter argument urging that Premier Malenkov be invited to the Bermuda Conference. . . . He advised Churchill to invite Eisenhower to join in a later meeting with Malenkov, but urged that if Eisenhower declined, then Churchill should meet with Malenkov anyway. . . .
>
> Prime Minister Churchill revealed that Soviet Ambassador Malik in London had come to see him with the message that Malenkov would be perfectly willing to meet him outside Russia, and suggested that Scandinavia would be a perfect meeting place during the summer months.

Whatever the truth or otherwise in these American reports, they reveal sufficiently the fears entertained in American quarters. But there has been no visible sign yet of any move by Britain towards a direct British-Soviet meeting, or British-Soviet-French meeting, in the event of further resistance by the United States. Yet this is the obvious answer to American obstruction, and the urgent necessity of the present situation.

Britain's Political Paralysis

The heart of the present problem lies in Britain. The dangerous delay and retarding of development in the international situation is the direct consequence of the weakening of the impetus of Britain's new initiative in foreign policy, which was opened by the Premier's speech of May 11, during these subsequent months. This is in part a reflection of the exceptional role and authority of the Premier in putting through this new turn in policy, which might not otherwise have been so easily accepted either in Tory ranks or in the ranks of the upper Labour leadership and indeed resistance by the old anti-Soviet Die-hards and worshippers of America in both parties is by no means at an end. In consequence the partial withdrawal of the Premier from normal political activity on account of illness since the end of June, on the very eve of the intended Bermuda Conference, has been followed by a visible slackening of Britain's

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

initiative. This weakening of direction has been all the more emphasised by the abnormal situation of the simultaneous absence through illness of the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary, the ill health of other leading Ministers, and the obvious secondary character and authority of remaining Ministers.

Heart of Britain's Problem

But even this visible weakness of government at a critical moment is not in itself the decisive feature of the situation. The new possibilities for peace did not arise in the first place from the initiative of the Premier, but from the objective situation, from the ever more widely supported campaign of the World Peace Movement for negotiations, from the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and China, and from the deepening contradictions in all spheres between Britain and the United States and the extending mass demand in Britain for an end to American domination and a turn to peace. All these conditions, possibilities, needs and desires remain, whatever the state of health of Her Majesty's Ministers. The decisive weakness in the present situation has not been the weakness of the Government. It has been the weakness of the official Opposition. The Labour movement should be in the forefront to rally the entire people in the fight for peace and for a new policy. But up to the present the dominant leadership has been more interested in banning and expelling fighters for peace, has handed over the initiative for peace to Toryism, and has spread discredit, division and impotence in its own ranks, in place of rising to the present unparalleled opportunity. This is the heart of the problem of the present political situation in Britain. It is this situation which can and must be changed by the demand and pressure of all within the labour movement, from top to bottom, who understand the seriousness of the issues involved for the whole future.

Memories of the Thirties

During the critical years of the thirties a long and arduous battle had to be waged by the left wing and the rank and file against the right wing leadership in order to endeavour to range the labour movement for peace and against the policies represented by Chamberlain and Munich. The right wing leadership supported the criminal policy of so-called 'non-intervention' in Spain (actually, complicity with fascist aggression); and a year's battle was needed

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before a subsequent annual conference could reverse that criminal policy. The right wing leadership consistently opposed unity of the supporters of peace, and purged and expelled even members of its own executive committee who supported such unity, which could alone have defeated Chamberlain and compelled a reversal of Britain's policy. When the resignation of Eden aroused nation-wide response and the universal demand for a change, it was the meeting of Citrine and Chamberlain, with the implication of T.U.C. support, which saved Chamberlain from downfall. The right wing leadership bade 'Godspeed' to Chamberlain for his Munich flight. It was this policy of consistent sabotage of peace and of unity for peace by the dominant right wing leadership in the labour movement, dictated by blind hatred of Communism and the Soviet Union, which made possible the maintenance of Chamberlain and the policies of Munich, and thereby rendered war inevitable. The situation is in many respects even more serious today. But the possibilities to compel a change are greater.

Abdication of Leadership

Today the dominant Labour leadership has surrendered the visible initiative for peace to Toryism—with disastrous results manifest at every by-election. Despite the Attlee speech of May 12, correctly responding to Churchill (but only after Churchill) and expressing British official policy, there has been no trace of effective reflection of this line in the current propaganda of Transport House. At a time when the labour movement should be in the forefront of the fight for peace and for the national independence of Britain from American domination, rallying and mobilising the response and enthusiasm of the entire nation for these aims, driving forward the action of the Government, exposing the inadequacies and vacillations of Tory policy, and preparing electoral victory for a new government, the existing dominant leadership have preferred during these critical weeks since May not only to trail behind Toryism in foreign policy, but to appear as the most rabid Die-hard exponents of anti-Soviet hostility and servility to the American war alliance.

How to lose By-Elections

What has been the record during these recent weeks? Resolutions and speeches of acclamation to the American provocation in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Berlin. Ostentatious front-bench identification with the murderers of the Rosenbergs. Nauseous boot-licking of American world domination ('if some country has to dominate the world, we should be thankful that it is the United States', *Daily Herald,* July 4, 1953). Such has been the public line of campaign. The accompaniment has been the new programme exhorting the workers to go short and tighten their belts in the name of the Holy Cold War and the Atlantic Anti-Comintern Axis. It is not surprising that, offered such fare by Labour, the electors, even in the midst of all the discontents of lowered standards, should vote increasingly for the Tories, in the faint flicker of hope that these, under Churchill's leadership, might possibly promote peace. The loss of Sunderland was followed by Abingdon, where every device of organisation was concentrated except a policy capable of winning the electors, and the resultant swing to Toryism at Abingdon was even more marked at Edgbaston. *But the lesson has still to be taken to heart by the leadership.*

'Challenge' to the Rank and File

The discussion around the draft programme 'Challenge to Britain' has revealed already the widespread dissatisfaction of the rank and file with this blatant expression of extreme right wing policy. But here arises the peculiar tactical stratagem which has been adopted in order to prevent the effective expression of the opinion of the affiliated membership on the most important questions of controversy. There is no doubt in what direction that opinion is running. Conference after conference of the affiliated trade unions during recent weeks has shown it: demands for a Five Power Peace Pact and the ending of the war in Korea (23); for the lifting of the bans on East-West trade (15); for cutting conscription to one year (17); for the national independence of Britain from American domination (9); for international trade union unity (6); against German and Japanese rearmament (4); as well as for wage increases (34) and shorter hours (17). The trend would be equally and even more marked in the divisional labour parties. But all these trends run directly contrary to the whole line and character of the draft programme, just as they carry forward the spirit and aims revealed at Blackpool and Morecambe. Thus there is a gulf of division between the overwhelming opinion of the membership revealed in these resolutions and the policy and outlook of Transport House expressed in 'Challenge to Britain'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A 'Confidence Trick' Programme

How far will this overwhelming opinion of the membership be able to find effective expression to amend and compel the drastic revision of this reactionary programme? This is the very sharp question now arising. And it is here that comes into play the peculiar strategy adopted by the authors of the programme in order to prevent effective amendment by the membership. The key to the programme is its assumption of the American cold war policy, the rearmament burden, the overseas military expenditure, and the bans on East-West trade. From this initial analysis follows the black economic prospect presented, the call to sacrifice and forego improvement of living standards, to accept a lower proportion of increased production in order to expand the capital accumulation, profits and investments of the capitalist class, increase the export of capital, force up dollar exports, etc., as the supposed only path to British economic recovery. But this programme is presented as a home programme divorced from the war policy governing it. International policy, it is explained, will be presented in a future separate document, which was originally to be published a month later, but which is now to appear only on the eve of the conference —too late for amendment by the organisations. But in fact the policy is assumed in the present document.

The Line of Battle

Thus it is hoped that the organisations will concentrate on amending the special sections of home policy, the proposals for different industries, the social services etc., while the real underlying policy is smuggled through in an introductory analysis which, while full of falsehoods, is least suitable for concrete amendment. In this way it is hoped that the burning questions of war and peace, which govern home policy, and on which the rising demand of the membership is inescapable, will be effectively removed from the sphere of amendment. It will be essential to defeat this stratagem, and to see that the decisive questions of peace and national independence, of ending the cold war, of lifting the trade bans and reducing arms expenditure, in order to raise social standards at home, will be effectively raised and fought and pressed to an issue, both in the present discussions of the programme, in the preparation of amendments and in the mandating of delegates for the forthcoming meetings of the Trades Union Congress and of the Labour Party Conference. Above all, it is essential to force the leadership to respond to the present urgent situation, and to voice the demand

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that Britain take the initiative for an immediate top-level conference with the Soviet Union, with or without the United States, and for the repudiation of Rhee and an immediate cease-fire in Korea.

Towards Douglas and Margate

The crucial battle which has now opened for ending the cold war, for hastening top-level negotiations of the powers without prior conditions or restrictions, for restoring Britain's freedom of action from subservience to American wishes, and for lifting the bans on East-West trade is inseparably bound up with the fight for increased wages and improved social standards at home. It is a battle which needs to be carried forward at once on the widest public plane, in current positive action and within the labour movement. A signal first step towards a change in Britain's alignment towards peace and Britain's independence of action, was taken with the speeches of Churchill and Attlee in May. That initiative won an enthusiastic response from the entire nation. But since then the counter-offensive has been in action. The American counter-offensive has been active to obstruct advance in the diplomatic field. The Churchill project was turned into Bermuda; and Bermuda was turned into Washington; and the outcome of Washington has been stamped with the demands of American policy (in consultation with Adenauer). At home the draft programme 'Challenge to Britain' is the platform of the right wing counter-offensive within the labour movement, the platform of the cold war and worsened standards. It is necessary to win back the initiative and to resume the offensive in both fields; and the two fronts are fronts of a single battle. There is no doubt of the feelings and the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the nation, as the response to every progressive initiative for peace has shown. But to give effective expression to these wishes the fullest mobilisation of the labour movement is essential to rise to the height of its present opportunities and responsibilities and force the Government to carry forward and implement the promises of last May, with or without the United States. We cannot afford to delay. The coming months are likely to be critical and decisive for the extension of war or a definite move towards peace. This is the paramount question, alike before the entire people, and above all before the organisations of the labour movement, as the discussion proceeds on the draft programme and in preparation for the coming Trades Union Congress at Douglas and the coming Labour Party Conference at Margate.

July 15, 1953. R.P.D.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHALLENGE TO BRITAIN

J. B. FIGGINS

THE delegates of this year's Conference of the Labour Party will have the great, the greatest ever responsibility—particularly because it not unprobably will be the last conference of the Party before the next General Election—of deciding its policy for dealing with the many problems, which are no longer escapable, facing the British People. The Party's Executive has issued its statement thereon under the appropriate arresting title of this article.

The statement is typical of British Labour thought. It is insular, national, imperialist and consequently thoroughly unrealistic. On the very first page we are told 'Socialism has become a necessity if we are to achieve the security and decent living standards we desire'. True, but if we were to accomplish everything that is proposed we would not have Socialism. The proposals are anti-Socialist. From a Socialist standpoint the Executive's statement, to put it as kindly as possible, is amazing. In the introduction one is pained to read the claim 'Behind all its proposals and underlying its analysis of the situation in which the nation is placed, lies the abiding faith of our organised movement in the moral and spiritual ideals which inspired its pioneers and founders'. Whoever penned these words of unblushing slander is apparently incapable of the feeling of deep burning shame. They are so obviously false that this barefaced attempt at deception will surely be intensely resented by every delegate whether rank-and-file or official leader.

The plan, we are plainly told, *'will involve sacrifices not only of material benefits* but *of many cherished habits and traditions'* (page 1); and 'nationalisation *only* for those industries where the immediate national need makes the case overwhelming' (page 7). It will 'encourage men and women to remain at work as long as possible' (page 23)—till they drop dead at work, I suppose. Denial of leisure for the workers, born to work only—what an ideal! Benefits, pensions or allowances, already below the value when introduced, are to be kept at that real value if cost of living rises (page 23). Maintenance of rent, interest and profit is inherent in all proposals. Management of industry is to remain the prerogative of the capitalists—is this how to establish the dignity of Labour?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Are these objects in accord with the 'moral and spiritual ideals which inspired the pioneers and founders' of our organised movement? What do trade unionists think of having to make sacrifices? Do the workers think these objects are worthy of labouring day in and day out to achieve? Do the members of the Labour Party imagine they give inspiration, will enable them to even maintain their electoral strength, not to speak of gaining sufficient support to defeat the Conservatives and again give Labour political power? Confidently I assert the members will conclude they are impracticable and invite certain political defeat, unfortunately of a resounding character. They are suicidal.

It was not for these objects that the constituency parties, out of their seven representatives to the National Executive of the Party, elected six who were openly critical of the leadership. Why then have they got into such a terrible bog from which it is questionable if they can emerge? It is all important to find the correct answer to this question and to take the necessary steps to prevent its recurrence. This is more important than criticism of the individual proposals, which I trust I am not over confident in believing will be decisively rejected. We simply cannot afford a repetition of such political blundering. The reason for this disaster is lack of contact with the working class and Socialist knowledge, understanding and conviction.

It was clear at the Morecambe Conference last year that the Constituency delegates did not understand they had only succeeded in making the Bevanites prisoners in the camp of their enemies, the trade union leaders, unless they acted in a certain way because of how the National Executive is composed. The trade union leaders have the majority; few, if any, of them are Bevanites. The remedy is in the hands of the Trade Union Executives to exercise care as to who they nominate and vote for.

If the Bevanites did not agree with the proposals, and can satisfactorily explain and prove conclusively that they voted against them on the Executive; and further, so as to avoid misunderstanding (if such there be) if they refuse to take any responsibility on behalf of the National Executive for moving and supporting them at the Conference, then the matter would be clear. This is the absolute minimum that can be permitted. It may be, and I am inclined to this view, that through fear of being accused of splitting the movement the Bevanites pursued the course of endeavouring to get the most satisfactory compromise. If so, then the Bevanites cannot

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

complain if they have to pay the penalty of sitting on the Executive under such conditions. If the conclusion of the *Economist* and other reputable papers is accurate that the policy is a compromise, then the Bevanites are in a hopeless tangle unless they courageously and openly admit their mistakes and now put forward a politically correct alternative policy. We have reached a stage in history when matters are far too serious for any other course to be tolerated.

This alternative policy must be propounded, not when the Conference meets, but right now. The moment of crisis is here. It is inexcusable—it is questionable if it is not criminal—to fail to act correctly on the great international issues on which the minds of the peoples are rightly focused. On these issues wrongful decisions have been and are being taken by the Right Wing trade union and labour leaders with possibly irreparable consequences for the lives and welfare of countless millions of men, women and children. Now is the time to prove the moral and spiritual ideals of our present-day movement. Let us, as did the pioneers and founders, despise material gain. It is not sufficient to be able to point out that the Left Wing M.P.s failed to get support from the Right for the proposal calling for four-power talks after Stalin's death; it is not sufficient to regret that Churchill seized the initiative which threatens seriously to result in the return of an increased Conservative majority at the next election. We must make our opportunity, not wait and see what Churchill and the Conservatives will do. Labour should lead the nation and appreciate that the British people can, as in the past, render an inestimable service to humanity. Let the Party Leaders remember what the rank and file have not forgotten from their schooldays:

> There is a tide in the affairs of men,
> Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
> Omitted, all the voyage of their life
> Is bound in shallows and in miseries.
> On such a full sea are we now afloat;
> And we must take the current when it serves,
> Or lose our ventures. (Shakespeare, *Julius Cæsar.*)

The basis of the complete failure of the National Executive to give an inspiring lead to the people is to be found in their incorrect analysis of the international situation. They are still obsessed with the idea that they are at the moment and will be for a long time to come, solely dependent on the United States of America. It is this fallacious belief that has enabled the U.S.A. almost to destroy British economy and therefore the welfare of the British people.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For this I regret to say the Labour Party bears not less than the Conservative Party a very heavy responsibility. This, of course, means that the process is of long standing, but particularly since the last war. The Labour Party believed that without American aid she could not recover, and the conditions laid down by the U.S.A. capitalists tightened their stranglehold. Instead of the economic and political position of Britain getting better it has got progressively worse, despite the great increase in production, which is still in this policy pamphlet being mistakenly advocated as our only salvation. The position has now developed to a point when the old policy can no longer be continued and remedial action is imperatively urgent.

But what is to be the remedial action? The policy suggested is modernisation of plant and machinery, increased production, continued dependence on the increasingly restricted so-called 'free market' wherein, to quote Mr. Butler, the competition of the U.S.A., Germany and Japan is greatly increasing. The policy suggested by the Executive is: 'Whenever the opportunity offers we must work to end the Cold War and halt the armament race. But so long as there is a threat of aggression Britain must share with her Allies the burden of military defence' (page 5). This is more reactionary than the militarists: compared with it Churchill is a revolutionary. No informed and sincere Labour member can stand for this, or the Party will be wrecked.

The generals of all countries say they do not expect the Russians to make an attack. Indeed it is universally accepted that Russia and China want peace, nor can anyone deny that they have taken the necessary steps to bring it about. Is not the opportunity to end the Cold War and halt the armament race here now, and has not the opportunity not been provided by Labour? Surely it is our duty to make, and not wait on others to make, such opportunity; is it not?

The decent instincts of mankind make abhorrence of war almost universal—there is no need for conversion of the nation. All that is required is determined leadership and insistence that all disputes between nations are settled by negotiation. The attainment of this objective means the end of huge military and armament expenditure. The saving on such would provide the necessary investment in civil industry and standards of living, and as C. A. G. Meade, Britain's delegate on the United Nations' Economic and Social Council has affirmed, there would be no trade depression. In my opinion, with the consequent expansion of trade between all nations, there would

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be a boom of no small dimensions. In this way would the means be found for the modernisation and development of the industries, though under national ownership.

What of all the talk of the need for sacrifices by the workers? Is it not therefore foolish? Further, would it not result, inevitably, in lower living standards and in the consequent trade depression that these Challenge proposals are professedly designed to prevent?

This is the immediate practical alternative policy which must be pressed home with remorseless determination.

A VETERAN'S VOICE FOR PEACE

FLORENCE MATTISON

EARLY this year I was summoned before the Executive Committee of the Leeds Labour Party to account for my actions in the Peace Committee and Women's Assembly: to say why I was working with everyone of every shade of political opinion and religious belief for the cause of Life itself. Memories of a lifetime's work for Peace and Socialism crowded in upon me. 'Could this be the end?' I asked myself, 'Is it that Peace should become a crime—Peace that so many Pioneers worked for, fought for and spoke for at the street corners, carrying the gospel to the people and built the foundations of the Labour Movement stone by stone?'

'No, not for this, and this is not the end. The spirit of the pioneers is being carried forward in these days too', came the thought 'and they, the men and women I knew, would have been in the forefront with the best of them'.

It was in 1897 that I joined the Leeds Labour Church, which met in one of the poorest quarters of Leeds. My eldest brother had brought a change into the lives of our family of four boys and two girls, who knew bitter poverty. My father was an unskilled worker in a clothing factory and had many bouts of unemployment. We took this poverty and privation as though it were a law of nature, but the *Clarion* told us it wasn't so and that by banding together and striking out for the end of the profit system, the brotherhood of man could be ours. I determined to strike out.

At this time in Leeds, there were not more than 100 to 150 avowed Socialists, but we worked together. We had a strong feeling of international brotherhood of the workers and as often as funds

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would allow brought speakers from many different countries, as well as national speakers, to Leeds. Above all, we knew war to be the greatest evil that could afflict mankind.

Our little group was soon put to the test. With the turn of the century came the South African War. No-one, who did not experience the hysteria prevailing at that time, could have believed it possible. Jingoism was rampant and it took brave men and women to stand up to it. But there is never a situation where such people are not to be found. The 'South African Conciliation Committee' was formed. The Quakers and the Socialists were its backbone. The leading spirit in it was Miss Isabella Ford, one of the first of the band of Socialists in our city. A meeting was called asking all those in favour of just and generous measures in the re-establishment of peace, to attend. It was at this meeting attended by 200-250 people that it was agreed to ask the deputation sent from the Cape Colony to Britain, to put the case for the Boers to public meetings in Leeds.

Outdoor meetings were arranged throughout the City. One of these was at Cross Flatts Park. Before the announced time of the meeting, hundreds of people were at the meeting place and their threatening tones and gestures left no doubt that they were far from friendly. But we were not to be intimidated. Miss Ford took the chair and exacted a promise that they would listen to the speakers, Professor De Vos and Mr. Du Plessis, put their case. At the end of the meeting our little band came together and walked to the Park exit. A stone was thrown, and only by jumping on a tram did we escape, though the shower of stones smashed the tram windows.

I went to a theatre with a friend. In the interval a gentleman gaily bedecked in military uniform and medals bestrode the stage, declaiming in stentorian tones, Kipling's *Absent-Minded Beggar.* * Great roars resounded to the roof, the people yelled their heads off and the tambourine went round. But we sat still. Threats came to throw us over the balcony and we narrowly escaped that fate.

We worked together knowing the justice of our cause. No-one was threatened with expulsions, no-one was intimidated for working for a just peace.

And the stand was not taken in vain. For Socialists in particular were becoming more and more conscious of the growing threat of

---

* *Absent-Minded Beggar,* R. Kipling.

'When you've shouted "Rule Britannia", when you've sung "God Save the King"
When you've finished killing Kruger with your mouth,
Will you kindly put a shilling in my little tambourine
For a gentleman in khaki ordered south?'

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war—of a terrible world-wide war, such as had never scourged humanity before. Peace organisations developed. The Women's International for Peace and Freedom, No More War Movements. Again they were united movements with the Socialists working with all who sought peace. Meetings were held, leaflets distributed and literature sold.

Then the nightmare of the war came. It found our Movement split. Some found place and privilege in the War Cabinet, but so many took what course they felt right to uphold their principles. One Saturday in the early days of the war of 1914, a group of not more than 20 of us marched through Briggate, the busiest shopping centre, carrying posters demanding 'Stop the War'. It was with fear and trembling that I participated in the parade but conviction spurred me on. Yet despite sneers and jeers, it was plainly noticeable that the mass hysteria of the Boer War days was absent, and that the ordinary people were apprehensive even then.

There were many conscientious objectors. We may, or may not, agree with that course of action, but the courage of those men, particularly Socialists, and those who opened their homes to them and helped them in any way they could, held high the banner of Socialism and international brotherhood.

How well this was shown in the Hands Off Russia Movement. What a powerful, all-embracing united movement it was. The people wanted peace, they were sick of war, of its misery, stench and degradation, and they also felt instinctively that Russia's people were opening up a wide, new world. Churchill was stopped from continuing the war. What could be done to stop a war against Russia then, can be done more powerfully today to stop Eisenhower and his band in Korea and to bring together the heads of the Big Powers.

All through the years between the wars I took my stand for peace inside the Labour Party and with every united organisation: and at the end of the war with the Peace Movement.

Mrs. Monica Felton visited Leeds to speak of her experiences in Korea. I took the chair. Her quiet convincing statement stirred me, as did the strained intent faces of the relatives of the P.O.W.'s in Korea, at that meeting. I pledged my vow, taken so many years ago, to work in unity with all who would make peace possible among men.

Maybe the following is a digression, but it is important to me and helped so much to strengthen my ever-mounting conviction. In

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1929 I visited the Soviet Union with a Co-operative delegation. Things were not easy for them then, but the spirit, confidence and *élan* of the people—the new Socialist people, filled my soul with hope. In 1952 I went again. Never in my wildest dreams, could I have believed, even without the terrible war, that they could have advanced so far. In vain do the powers that be seek by lies and misrepresentation to decry the Soviet Union. In vain do they hope by the threat of war to undermine the faith of the people of Russia in their way of life. They are rightly proud of their achievements and are entitled to the assurance that nothing can destroy it.

Recently I attended the World Congress of Women at Copenhagen and here I found, in this vast meeting of women from over 70 nations, the answer to our strivings, not only for Peace but for understanding. Here under one roof, with one purpose were women of every creed, colour and conviction, standing together united against this evil that bestrides the world. This war hysteria that makes beasts of men, that denies decency, battens on starving people and makes a travesty of life. Here is a World Peace Movement stretching out to every section of women in every land and we who represented Britain were proud to take part in it; working not only for peace but for the Rights of Women, the right to work and the right for children to live in a decent world.

It was apparently a tiny seed of peace that was set in the course of the South African War by a small handful of people. But they kept faith and that is what is indestructible. To what sturdy dimensions it has grown. Today we have in our land (as in every land on earth) a peace movement, capable of embracing every honest person who stands for peace: we have the National Assembly of Women, which is stretching out to every section of women, something I had hoped both the Suffragettes and the Labour Women's Sections would do. We are yet at the beginning, but it is a powerful beginning, growing in the right direction and it can give aim, purpose and activity to the countless, nameless millions.

I am convinced that a great united Socialism movement will continuously develop as the backbone of every forward looking progressive peace and national independence movement. From 1897 onwards, all my life's work has taught me that truth cannot be expelled, nor can fear replace principle. If possible, I am more sure with each day that passes, that the power of the people and their brotherhood will prevail.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BEASTS GONE MAD

—A European Looks at America*

JEAN-PAUL SARTRE

THE Rosenbergs are dead and life goes on. That is what you wanted, isn't it? Only yesterday we were their comrades and you have killed them as fast as you could so that we should only be their survivors. You count on time to make us every day a little more forgetful, a little guiltier toward them to make you seem a little less cruel. Of course it will cost a little: there will be broken window panes in your embassies. But you will put in new ones and, with a little luck, the cops will shoot on the European crowds and we'll have brand new corpses all our own to turn our thoughts away from your two.

You already played that trick on us with Sacco and Vanzetti and you won. This time you won't.

On one point you will win: we want to harm no one; the horror and contempt you awake in us we refuse to turn into hate. But you will never make us swallow that the execution of the Rosenbergs was nothing but a 'regrettable incident', or even a judicial error. It was a legal lynching which smears a whole nation with blood and which once and for all lays bare the bankruptcy of the Atlantic Pact and your inability to lead the Western world.

Let me tell you what your mistake was: you believed that the murder of the Rosenbergs was a private settling of accounts. A hundred thousand voices cried out: 'They are innocent'. And stupidly you answered: 'We are punishing two of our citizens according to our laws. It's none of your business'.

Well, now, that's just it—the Rosenberg case is our business: innocents who are sent to their death are the business of the whole world. The spokesman of the Vatican himself was saying only last Thursday: 'Civilisation has before it a choice on which depends its acquittal or its condemnation'. Everywhere people cried out to you: 'Watch out! You judge yourselves in judging them; we shall have to decide whether you are men or beasts'.

Do you understand now why we begged you for a new trial? When we asked for justice for the Rosenbergs we meant also: 'Make sure that your cause is just'. When we begged you to spare their

* From the Paris *Liberation* of June 22, with acknowledgements for the translation to the New York *National Guardian* of July 6.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lives, it meant also: 'Spare your own'. Now that we have been made your allies, the fate of the Rosenbergs could be a preview of our own future. You, who claim to be masters of the world, had the opportunity to prove that you were first of all masters of yourselves. But if you gave in to your criminal folly, this very folly might tomorrow throw us headlong into a war of extermination. No one in Europe was duped: whether you gave life or death to the Rosenbergs was the measure of whether you were preparing for peace or world war.

There had been the sinister clowning of MacArthur, the bombings on the Yalu, McCarran's cops: each time you double-crossed Europe and stood alone. And yet, your friends kept a small hope: if our governments were not able to get across their points of view it was because they disagreed among themselves, it was because France had not stood by England, it was because they were not backed by the people. But yesterday, it was the whole of Europe that moved as one—its masses, its priests, its cabinet ministers, its heads of state—to ask your President to make the simplest gesture of humanity.

We were not asking for your dollars, nor for your armaments, nor for your soldiers; only for two lives, two innocent lives.

Have you even understood the scope of this extraordinary truce? Class conflicts, the oldest bitternesses—all were set aside: the Rosenbergs had produced European unity. One word from you, and you too would have reaped the benefits of this unification. The whole of Europe would have honoured you. You answered: 'To hell with Europe'. Very well. But don't come to us any more with talk of an alliance. Allies consult one another, talk matters over, make mutual concessions. If you answer 'No' when all we ask you is not to dishonour yourselves to no purpose, how can we believe that you will allow us to speak out when our larger interests are at stake?

Us, your allies? Cut it out! Our governments today are your domestic servants. Tomorrow our people will be your victims. It's as simple as that. Of course you will come out with shameful excuses: your President couldn't grant clemency to the Rosenbergs, he had to lighten ballast in order to impose his will in Korea. In Korea? Whom are you kidding? He is being mocked every day there by his own generals and by old Syngman Rhee.

And what sort of country is this, whose statesmen are obliged to commit ritual murders so that they should be forgiven for stopping a war?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

*Drawings of Greece Today

Tony Ambatielos, who was General Secretary of the Federation of Greek Maritime Unions in Britain during the war years, symbolises the strength and courage of the Greek people in their struggle for liberty.

* From the book of drawin

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by Paul Hogarth

The "houses" the workers live in.

Children, barefooted themselves, shine the shoes of others, to help support their unemployed parents.

DEFIANT PEOPLE"

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We know now what kind of weight we amount to in your scales. On one side you put the world—on the other, McCarthy. When the Rosenbergs sat on the electric chair, the scales were down on the side of McCarthy.

Do you believe we are going to die for McCarthy? Bleed from every artery to give him a European Army? Do you believe we are going to defend the culture of McCarthy? The justice of McCarthy? That we shall let Europe be turned into a battlefield so that this blood-stained imbecile can burn books? Please understand this right now: Never shall we hand the leadership of the western world to the murderers of the Rosenbergs.

You say that McCarthy will pass and that you are secretly planning his downfall? So what then? Your McCarthy has millions of heads. Chop one off and a hundred will sprout.

Look—I have before me on my table a photo taken last Thursday in Washington: well-fed and well-dressed men, elegant young women, are marching by asking for the execution of the Rosenbergs. In the foreground a young and pretty girl carries a sign: 'Fry them and send the bodies to Moscow'.

You saw these people walk in your streets at the very moment when a man and his wife were living their last hours in prison, when two desperate children were asking in vain that their parents should be returned to them. You saw them laugh, shout, wave their signs and banners—and there wasn't one among you to go and bash their heads in. Decidedly there is something rotten in America.

Don't tell us these are only a few excitable persons, irresponsible elements. These are the very masters of the country, for it is to them that your government has given in. Do you remember Nuremberg and your theories on collective responsibility? Well, today it applies to you. You are collectively responsible for the death of the Rosenbergs, some for having sponsored this murder, the rest for having suffered it. You have allowed America to become the cradle of a new fascism. It will be useless to explain to us that this single murder is not comparable to Hitler's mass exterminations. Fascism is not defined by the number of its victims but by the manner in which they are killed.

And why this rage unleashed against a man and a woman about to die? Why this hatred which has dumbfounded the world?

Why—because you had got the notion they wanted to take your bomb! You will not rest until you are the only ones capable of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blowing up the earth. President Eisenhower counted in tens of millions the innocent victims of the Rosenbergs: each one of you feels already that he is one of the dead in the war to come. Dead people it is who asked for death, last Thursday, for the thieves of the atomic secret.

Unfortunately, when we look at you from Europe we see you neither as innocents nor as corpses. We see but two innocent corpses —your victims. As for the atomic secret, it is the fruit of your sick imaginations: science develops everywhere at the same rhythm, and the manufacture of bombs is a mere matter of industrial capacities.

By killing the Rosenbergs you have quite simply tried to halt the progress of science by human sacrifice. Magic, witch-hunts, auto-da-fes, sacrifices—we are here getting to the point: your country is sick with fear. You are afraid of everything: of the Soviets, of the Chinese, of the Europeans. You are afraid of one another, you are afraid of the shadow of your own bomb. Some allies we have!

And you want to lead the way for us! You are dragging us into war through terror—a war you would promptly lose through panic at the first bombardment. I know there are brave people in your country: the lawyer for the Rosenbergs, for instance, this very man who was saying yesterday: 'I am ashamed of being an American'. Justice Douglas, whom you are no doubt going to persecute. The people of the Rosenberg Committee, hundreds of thousands of others. But what can they do but head towards martyrdom?

And then there are the masses—still basically healthy, although befuddled by you. There are the Negroes whom you oppress. And above all, there is that small voice which was stilled yesterday, yet which can be heard better than your ranting—the voice speaking these wonderful words: 'We are young, and we do not want to die, but we cannot pay this price for our lives'.

After all, the Rosenbergs are Americans—and if we can still have some hope, it is because your country gave birth to this man and this woman whom you have killed.

Some day, perhaps, all these people of goodwill will cure you of your fears. We hope so, for we have loved you.

Meanwhile do not be astonished if we cry out from one end of Europe to the other: Watch out! America has the rabies! Cut all the ties which bind us to her, otherwise we will in turn be bitten and run mad!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OLD FALLACIES FOR NEW

ANDREW ROTHSTEIN

I.

AFTER being deluged and deafened for years with boasts about the benefits of 'free enterprise' and the American way of life, the nations of Europe are stirring in revolt against the Wall Street yoke. The Tory leader himself has made the first uncertain gesture for British independence. Within the Labour Party, as the agenda for its next Annual Conference shows, the demand for a socialist policy in home and foreign affairs is growing louder. And at this moment Mr. John Strachey hastens to the defence of monopoly capitalism.

In 1938, Mr. Strachey in a book, now out of date, declared that capitalism was declining, and that, taking the world situation as a whole, 'the dominant capitalists have today interests which are flatly incompatible with the maintenance of human civilisation'. Fifteen years later—after a second world war in which at least thirty million people lost their lives, three times as many as in the first—the same author told readers of the *New Statesman and Nation* (May 23) that there is a new kind of capitalism.

There is a 'democratic form of the last stage of capitalism', he stated. It is 'State monopoly capitalism in a democratic environment'—'a new oligopolistic stage . . . in a democratic political setting'. In this new kind of capitalism, the 'countervailing forces' of trade unionism and the voters have more, not less, economic power than ever before. It exists in Britain and America, Strachey said, and it has 'recently raised the real income of the mass of the population at least in proportion to the rise in productivity'. As a result, 'the fatal sequence of slump, stagnation and aggression' has been rendered 'unnecessary'.

This picture was, of course, a direct contradiction of Marx's analysis: and Mr. Strachey, in three previous articles (May 2, 9 and 16), had in fact begun by explaining where Marx was wrong. Marx (he said) had believed that the level of wages was determined by what the worker needed to keep alive and fit for work, with the means to breed up children, 'and no more'. Wages, in Marx's opinion (according to Strachey), could not be forced up by workers' pressure on the capitalists: in fact, he didn't believe that trade unions could 'really gain anything substantial for the workers',

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Their real purpose in Marx's view, wrote Strachey, was 'to create, to drill, to mobilise the army of labour'. As for that army itself, Marx had, in the 'peroration' of his *Capital*, 'enunciated the famous doctrine of "ever-increasing misery" '.

Marx had in fact underestimated, according to Strachey, 'the economic consequences which trade union and political pressure in a democracy could have in modifying the basic economic trends of the system'—consequences which would crown such pressure with an 'extraordinary degree of success'. But these errors were multiplied when it came to Marx's followers, the Communists.

Communists, said Strachey, don't 'genuinely care' about winning material advantages through strikes: at least they 'think that this is all really only a rehearsal for "the day" ', and 'always tend to strike even when the chances of success are remote'. They have a 'mechanistic lack of belief in the possibility of political and industrial action in a democracy'. They even say 'there will soon be an American slump'. They can 'see only one form of the last stage of capitalism'—the 'essentially German, anti-democratic and finally Fascist form'. So no wonder 'the British workers have been unaffected by the Communist case' and have 'gone Labour instead of Communist', these last 30 years.

Crushed and confounded, the Communists can only ask in awe why it was necessary, then, to devote four long articles in the *New Statesman and Nation* to exposing them. Or is there something more to be said?

II.

Indeed there is. Let us begin with Marx. Marx did not believe that wage levels were determined by what it takes to produce the worker and his children, 'and no more'. Marx said that this was one of the components of the value of labour power. The other was 'a historical and moral element', which depended on 'the conditions in which, and consequently on the habits and degree of comfort in which, the class of free labourers has been formed' (*Capital*, Vol. I, ch. 6). In his *Value, Price and Profit* he called this 'a traditional standard of life', springing from 'the social conditions in which people are placed and reared up'.

And how could these social conditions, these traditions, come into existence? Precisely by the trade unions gaining something substantial for the workers. Nowhere did Marx talk about the trade unions drilling and mobilising, much less 'creating' the army of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labour. On the contrary, in the *Communist Manifesto* he was already showing how such 'permanent associations' came into being as a result of the organisation of the proletarians into a class. As for them not being able to gain anything substantial for the workers, Marx was forever pointing out the successes of the British trade unions in improving the workers' conditions. Thus, in the *Manifesto* (1848), he instanced how the Ten Hours Act was carried in 1847 under the workers' pressure, compelling 'legislative recognition of particular interests of the workers'. In his *Poverty of Philosophy*, the previous year, Marx had championed trade unions (against the influential Proudhon) as 'ramparts for the workers' in their struggle for 'the maintenance of wages'. The relations of profit and wages, he wrote in *Value, Price and Profit* (1865) are 'settled by continuous struggle between capital and labour', according to the 'respective powers of the combatants': and trade unions 'work well as centres of resistance against the encroachments of capital'. If they failed, it was through 'limiting themselves to guerrilla war against the effects of the existing system, instead of simultaneously trying to change it'. So also in Vol. I of *Capital* (1867) he showed that the creation of a normal working day was a victory, 'the result of a long struggle of classes . . . a protracted civil war, more or less dissembled, between the capitalist class and the working class' (Chapter 10).

Engels too, in his well-known articles published by the London Trades' Council's *Labour Standard* (1881), wrote of the trade unions as having become 'acknowledged institutions . . . a power to be taken into account by any government of the ruling class', whose great merit was that 'they tend to keep up and to raise the standard of life'. Where they fell short, Engels said, was in failing to go on from that to the struggle for 'the abolition of the wages system'. Other examples could be quoted. Nowhere did either Marx or Engels speak of trade unions in the inhuman, semi-militarist terms imputed to them by Strachey.

There is, in fact, a conversation on record between Marx and a German metal workers' official, Haman, in 1869, in which Marx called the trade unions 'a school of Socialism', in which the workers 'learn Socialism' just because every day there takes place before their eyes a struggle in which their material conditions ought to be improved—leaving them more leisure to educate themselves and their children, look after their health, etc.

How about 'the famous doctrine of "increasing misery",' then? It will be simplest to quote the 'peroration' itself, from chapter 32

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

('Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation') of *Capital*, Vol. I. Marx is writing of world-wide capitalist development, culminating in 'the entanglement of all peoples in the net of the world-market and, with this, the international character of the capitalistic régime'. And he continues:

> Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolise all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; *but with this too grows the revolt of the working class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organised by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself.*

Why was it necessary for Mr. Strachey to leave out the passage here italicised—an integral part of the 'peroration'? Because it would cast doubt on his picture of Marx ignoring the value of trade unions as a means of gaining 'anything substantial' for the workers. The workers could hardly be disciplined, united and organised by bodies which habitually let them down in the struggle for every-day improvements and only sought to drill and mobilise them. Much less could they be a 'school of Socialism' for the working class in revolt against capitalism.

III.

But in fact there is no need for revolt, if the picture drawn by Strachey of present-day 'oligopolistic' capitalism is true. All that is needful is to allow the democratic political setting, the countervailing forces of trade unionism and voting, to operate. Is that really so?

In Britain and America, says Strachey, there is State monopoly capitalism in a democratic environment. Where is this environment? The geographical environment of American state monopoly capitalism is (i) the military dictatorships in Central and South America whom the U.S.A. openly supports because they guarantee the profits of its investor companies there—with the exception of the democratic régime in Guatemala which it hates and intrigues against (ii) the colonial dictatorships which it maintains itself, under ever so thin a veil, in the Philippines and Puerto Rico (iii) its puppet régimes in South Korea, Taiwan (Formosa) and Japan (iv) the régimes of terrorist suppression of the working-class movement which it publicly finances in Franco Spain, Greece, Turkey and Yugoslavia. Wherever else a step can be taken, with dollars or military supplies, to interfere in a country's internal affairs, even to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the extent of excluding the representatives of the working class from the government and altering the constitution to make this permanent, if possible, the U.S.A. does it: witness France and Italy five years ago. What a democratic environment!

Politically the environment of U.S. monopoly capitalism is (i) the unparalleled political victimisation in America of which the McCarthys and McCarrans are only the instruments (ii) the constant war propaganda of highly-placed generals and ministers (iii) the system of brazen judicial frame-up and terror against everything 'left', unequalled outside Hitler Germany, of which the Rosenberg case is but the most sickening example (iv) the armed thuggery against militant workers carried on by employers and almost irremovable trade union bureaucracies (v) the gerrymandering of the electoral system against Negroes and progressives, shown by analysis of all election figures (vi) the gross misuse of the press to silence protest and blackmail progressives in every sphere, cultural as well as political. Very democratic: for further details see Philip Bolsover's *America Over Britain* and Derek Kartun's *U.S.A. '53*.

And what is the geographical environment of British monopoly capitalism? The colonial investors' wars raging in Malaya and Kenya—a combination of the methods of butchery used to suppress the Indian Mutiny, with more modern weapons, of course, and the cynical denial that the fighting native patriots are supported by the mass of their people which was a commonplace of Britain's war on Ireland in 1919-1922. The imposition of hated settler rule by 160,000 white planters on six million Africans, without even the pretence that the latter agree, in Central Africa—with more British investments to safeguard. The maintenance of British military occupation in Egypt, after seventy years of as many hypocritical promises to withdraw it: but Suez Canal and other shares well protected. The refusal of self-determination, in spite of the clearly expressed wish of the people, to Cyprus. The régime of police rule practised by the British puppet governments in Northern Ireland and the West Indies. Oh, most democratic. Did Mr. Strachey never read Hobbes in his *Leviathan* pointing out that 'those provinces which are in subjection to a democracy or aristocracy of another commonwealth (are not) democratically or aristocratically governed, but monarchically' i.e. despotically?

So Mr. Strachey's new, alternative, democratic form of state monopoly capitalism reduces itself, on examination, and in a very conditional form, to the *internal* situation in Britain, where a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moderately democratic régime gives scope for trade union activity and working-class organisation—and to forget the bloody repressions in the colonial backyard, of which Mr. Strachey wrote himself (*Why You Should Be A Socialist*, May, 1938), that the 'principal' circumstance making possible 'a certain amount of social progress' in Britain is 'the possession by our employing class of the biggest and richest empire in the world'. True, the empire has been somewhat modified in shape since then—but super-profits from India and Pakistan for British investors are still wrung from the working people of those countries held down in dire poverty by governments which, in this respect at least, have not changed the methods used during the British occupation.

IV.

When Mr. Strachey sneers at Marx's picture of the growing mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation (omitting to mention that Marx was referring to the world as a whole), and *contrasts* it with the alleged success of 'trade union and political pressure in a democracy', he is wrong in every particular.

First, because what improvements have been secured by the workers in the advanced industrial countries since Marx died, 80 years ago, must be set against the forty million dead, and innumerable millions crippled and ruined in two world wars: not to speak of such preliminaries as the Sino-Japanese (1894), Spanish-American (1898), Boer (1899), Russo-Japanese (1904) and Balkan (1912) wars and innumerable 'little wars' in colonial countries.

Secondly, because precisely the period since Marx died has seen the development on an enormous scale of the intensified exploitation of the colonial peoples, for the sake of their raw materials and such market possibilities as they represented.

The rulers of a few score millions of whites in Western Europe and America are able to use super-profits from colonial exploitation both to make some concessions to pressure from the white workers and to find resources for technological improvements in their industry. In return hundreds of millions in the colonial world of Asia, Africa and Latin America are driven off their best lands, forced to labour on plantations in the worst conditions, denied fair prices for their own products, herded into industry at low wages—in short, subjected to the worst miseries and a hundred degradations, fully justifying Marx's words. The process has lately been exhaus-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tively described and analysed in R. P. Dutt's *Crisis of Britain and the British Empire.*

Thirdly, because the particular improvement on which Strachey concentrates—the alleged raising of 'the real income of the mass of the population at least in proportion to the rise in productivity'—is far from established and certain even for Britain and the U.S.A. Thus in the U.S.A., Gunther Stein has pointed out (*The World The Dollar Built*, p. 231), the wage earners share of the national income, even in face value, averaged 65.35 per cent. in the five pre-war years, 64.30 per cent. during the five war years, and 64.21 per cent. in the first six post-war years. Average *real* wages, as a result of increasing tax burdens, were 1.4 per cent. lower in 1951 than before the war, although the workers' productivity was nearly 35 per cent. higher (*ibid*, pp. 228, 230).

As for Britain, Strachey himself shows that in 1935, after nearly a quarter of a century of fluctuations, the workers share of the national income was barely more than it had been in 1911 (40.5 per cent. as against 39 per cent.)—despite the concessions secured as the result of supporting World War I, (described vividly by the Webbs in their 1920 chapters of the *History of Trade Unionism*)—and was nearly 20 per cent. less than in 1860. He thinks the share 'probably rose in the last 15 years': wise caution, since even official figures show a fall of five per cent. in real wages since 1947. Yet the average productivity, he says, has more than doubled since 1870!

Of course the British working class gained some concessions once more during the second world war as the reward for taking on the job of national defence when the bankrupt Tories dropped it—improved health services, wage increases for worst-paid workers like agricultural labourers, free milk and cheap dinners for school children, larger numbers of workers getting paid annual holidays, etc. Yet the whittling away of even these concessions began several years ago. And is there not a world of significance in these figures of United Kingdom consumption per head, published by the *Economist* (May 30, 1953)?

		1900	1934-38	1951
Tea	(lbs.)	6.1	9.3	8
Meat	„	133	110	75
Butter	„	14	25	15
Sugar	„	85	104	82
Potatoes	„	235	176	237
Margarine	„	0	9	18

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Strachey is welcome to the consolation he gets from our becoming a potato-and-margarine-eating nation, for the indisputable evidence that in consumption of staple foodstuffs Britain in 1951 was on the whole back to where she was 50 years ago.

What sharp practice it is, in these circumstances, for Mr. Strachey to tell his readers that stagnation and slump have become 'unnecessary'! Does it make them impossible? Strachey himself takes care not to say that: indeed he makes some pretty dismal remarks about complete economic stability being 'the very last thing we can hope for from America', about 'our moderate-sized craft' being simply 'swamped' when the first wave of American instability hits it, and about any British Government having to try 'desperately hard' to avoid slump. Indeed he tells us that it would run counter to the principles of any capitalist oligarchy to act so as to avoid fluctuation and stagnation.

What does he mean then, by saying that slump is 'unnecessary', i.e. can be avoided? The key is not easily found amidst his slippery mesh of ambiguous phrases. Yet it is there. A slump, he says, 'would be fatal for democratic government'. It is necessary 'to push ahead with the transformation into Socialism' which began 'between 1945 and 1950'. Transformation of what? Why, State monopoly capitalism in a democratic political environment. That is to say, slump *may* be avoided (and then only provided the Americans don't bring it down on us) if the workers accept the continuance of the Empire, and above all, if they follow the last Labour government's policy of doing nothing to injure the interests of British monopoly capitalists. But if they don't heed the advice, if they help the colonial peoples to end the very peculiar 'democratic environment' they suffer from, if they try to end monopoly capitalism instead of transforming it—why then, let them look out for slump, say goodbye to democracy, and blame themselves.

That, incidentally, is why all the elaborate 'refutation' of Marx was needed—Marx who always said plainly that 'wages are determined above all by their relation to the gain, the profit of the capitalist' (*Wage-Labour and Capital*). At this point Mr. Strachey's remarks about the Communists deserve some attention.

(to be continued)

LABOUR MONTHLY SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *United Kingdom, 12 months, 18s. post free; $3.00 in U.S.A. and Canada ($3.50 if first class mail); elsewhere overseas, 19s. post free.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ITALY

JOHN PLATTS-MILLS

IF the political crisis that deprived France of a government for more than a month reflected a critical attitude towards America in Europe, still more did the absence of a government in Italy for five weeks after the general election of 1953. All the American plans suffered a major set-back. June 7, was a triumph for the Italian people, for their national independence and for the cause of world peace. It was also a triumph for the policy of close co-operation in the working-class movement followed by the Communists under the leadership of Togliatti and by the Socialist Party under Nenni. It was a defeat not only for U.S. policy but also for the Vatican and incidentally for Right-Wing Social-Democrats.

The outcome was a set-back to America's aggressive designs, a sharp rebuff to her specific plan for the establishment of a new regime in Italy—a rebuff whose significance in the present situation can be compared to that administered by the people of Czechoslovakia in February, 1948. A sinister calculation was never worked out more openly or more blatantly. The main aim of the election was to place De Gasperi in a position in which he could subvert the constitution—the constitution of 1949, which truly embodied the best hopes that flowed from the liberation from fascism. The amendment of the constitution required a two-thirds majority and De Gasperi knew for certain that no such vote could be obtained by him. The purpose of the electoral law, fought so bitterly for six months in the Italian parliament, was to enable De Gasperi, provided he obtained a vote of 50 per cent. plus one, to take in the Chamber (which alone is important in Italy) sufficient seats to alter the constitution; gerry-mandering and corruption on a superlative scale. Behind this move was the whole weight of American and Clerical intervention. Its extent and intensity exceeded that of 1948. If then there were American airplanes over the cities and men-of-war in the harbours, today they are actually stationed there. If then there was a pontifical interdict against voting for the parties of the Left, today it was announced from every pulpit. If this pressure was more discreet in 1953, there was one exception in the case of the egregious Claire Booth Luce.

De Gasperi undoubtedly intended a *coup d'état*. He declared his intention of striking the progressive measures out of the constitu-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion; he had drafted the laws that were to crush the genuine trade unions and muzzle the democratic press; behind it lay his purpose of challenging and destroying the militant organisations of the working class. This plot was shattered by the vote of the Italian people:

	1948			1953		
Government Bloc	*Votes*	%	*Seats*	*Votes*	%	*Seats*
Christian Democrats ..	12,712,562	47.7	306	10.859.554	40.1	262
Social-democrats ..	1,858,346	7.1	33	1,223,870	4.5	19
Liberals	1,004,819	3.8	18	815,681	3	14
Republicans	652,477	2.5	9	437,899	1.6	5
Others	—	—	4	150,034	0.5	4
	16,228,204	61.1	370	13,487,038	49.7	303
Left Bloc						
Communists	8,151,119	31	131	6.122,638	22.6	143
Socialists (Nenni) ..			52	3,440,222	12.7	75
Others			—	292,332	—	—
	8,151,119	31	183	9,855,192	35.4	218
Right Bloc						
Monarchists	729,174	2.8	9	1,856,661	6.8	40
Neo-fascists (M.S.I.) ..	525,670	2	6	1.580,395	5.9	29
Others	—	2.3	5	602,230	2.2	—
	1,254,844	7.1	20	4,039,286	14.9	69

In the Lower House, the Christian Democrats have now 262 seats with a loss of 44. Their attendant parties are virtually shattered. The Communists have advanced to 143 with a gain of 12, the Socialists to 75 with a gain of 23; the Monarchist and Fascist parties have gained 49 seats giving them a total of 69, but this is very much less than was expected when we know that in the local elections of 1951-52 they gained 3½ million votes from the Christian Democrats.

How could so heavy a weight of intervention, so copious a flow of dollars and blackmail be denied? For five years the Italian people had faced the consequences of yielding to the similar bribes of 1948. They had seen mounting now chronic unemployment. They had known a permanent state of unrest in every industrial enterprise. They had felt the police laws of Mussolini applied against them unaltered. The peasants knew that less than two per cent. of the promised land reform had been carried out. They were bitter at the trickery and angry at the prospect of the return of Fascism, backed by the Church and by America. They had felt

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in these last months the relaxation of the tension and war danger, they had sensed the possibility of peace.

It is not the vote alone that now determines the position in Italy. There has been a profound change in the attitude of the Italian people. De Gasperi must take account of the fact that many of his own supporters are looking for a change of policy. This agent of America is compelled to call upon Togliatti and Nenni at least to discuss the question of the government of the country. Saragat, the Right-Wing Social-Democrat who split from Nenni in 1948, who plunged into the adventure of the electoral law 'blinded by the mirage of seats in the Chamber at two a penny', as Nenni said of him, demands that Nenni be brought into the government. The Chairman of the Chamber, a leading figure in De Gasperi's party, calls for co-operation with the Left. Every group in the Government Coalition is disrupted and seeks a new orientation. After weeks of enquiry the chaos is such that De Gasperi flies to London for what was after all only a private conversation with Winston Churchill.

Over past months there have been many signs of determination amongst the people of Europe to assert their independence. This is the first great *national* demonstration of this purpose. In this lies the profound importance for the people of the world. For the British Labour Party it has a deeper and more personal importance. Nenni was the Italian Labour Party. In 1944 the British Labour Party, rejoicing with the Italian Socialist Party on their emergence from Fascist bondage, said 'their two Parties may look forward with confidence to a long period of mutual and fruitful collaboration'. The Italian Socialists and Communists were working closely together when this greeting was sent. The election programme of the Labour Party greeted the Italian Socialist Party as working in harmony with the Communist Party. This support was maintained until the very eve of the election of 1948. But Nenni had refused to bow his knee to the Americans. In the election of 1948 Mr. Attlee supported Saragat, himself a signatory of the pact between the Italian Socialists and Communists, who on American instructions had split the Italian Socialist Party. For five years, Saragat, a minor Ramsay MacDonald or Thomas, held his splinter group in the Clerical group in the government, a pawn of the American government. Attlee still supported him in 1953. The working class of Italy did not—his representation in the Chamber fell from 33 to 19 while that of Nenni rose from 52 to 75.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TWO HEALTH SERVICES

DR. RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR

We are pleased to print this report of a press interview (19.6.1953) given in New Delhi by Dr. Kaur, India's Health Minister, on her return from an eighteen-day tour in the Soviet Union. Dr. Kaur, one of the best known of the older Congress leaders, was a close associate of Gandhi: and this lends her testimony in contrasting conditions in the Soviet Union and in India a very special interest.—Ed. L.M.

DR. KAUR said the extensive health services from village to village in Russia were 'really a miracle'. The care of children, mothers and workers, both physical and psychological, was truly wonderful in Russia. 'What has been achieved in Russia during the past 35 years is absolutely a miracle considering that after the Tsarist régime the country started from scratch—from nothing—while countries like Britain had centuries of development'.

In Russia great stress was laid on prevention of disease. Russia spent 22 per cent. of her budget on defence and 26.2 per cent. on health and education. There was a strong desire for peace everywhere in Russia and there was warmth, affection and cordiality of feeling towards India. The Russians laughed when we talked of limiting our population in India. There was no birth control in Russia and they were eager to increase their population.

Asked what she told the Russians about India and her progress and achievements, amid a burst of laughter, Dr. Kaur said: 'Of course, you would not expect me to tell them lies! I told them of things we have done and are trying to do'.

The Russian people said: 'We cannot have happy people without health. We cannot produce without healthy people.' There was central control and guidance to work out uniform health standards. Therefore, progress was rapid. There were some hospitals where there had not been even a single death among maternity cases for years. The rate of infant mortality was only one per cent.

Before the revolution in Uzbekistan, there was one doctor for 31,000 persons. Today there was one doctor there for 890 persons. In Georgia there was one doctor now for 370 persons. There was not a single village in the remotest corner of Russia which did not have health service facilities. 'That is the miracle of Russia, really'.

There were primary dispensaries and district hospitals with modern equipment and services, and with doctors, pathologists, gynaecologists and radiologists and X-ray departments. They were of the same pattern whether near Moscow or near Tashkent.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Doctors were encouraged to go to villages. They were given extra facilities, like free housing, electricity and water, and higher salaries. The care of children in Russia was remarkable. Epidemics like typhus and cholera had been elminated and research institutions were carrying out important research work.

Dr. Kaur was even more eloquent in her description of health resorts and sanatoria at Sochi and the Black Sea coast, and in the Urals and elsewhere, where workers were sent from different parts of Russia for rest and relaxation: 'These sanatoria are absolutely wonderful. I have not seen anything like them anywhere else. About four to five million workers go to these sanatoria every year for rest and holiday'.

Asked whether those conditions of health services and care for workers could be created in India, she said rather helplessly: 'Where is the money?' However, she was of the view that more central control and guidance in health services would give better results. 'India would be much better off if we have more central control and more money'.

Asked if she was in favour of methods adopted by Russia to raise money, she said: 'Up to a point we could follow their methods of finding money'.

FROM THE *LABOUR MONTHLY* OF 25 YEARS AGO

THE T.U.C. and CAPITALISM

In agreeing with Mondism have the trade union leaders abandoned Socialism? Right-wing writers have argued, no. The Trade Union Movement is still free to hold to its ideals. This is undoubtedly true. The capitalists have no objection to the Trade Union Movement holding to its ideals so long as it does not draw practical everyday conclusions from them. But surely anyone can see that the perspective opened out by the interim report of the General Council is not a mere transitional co-operation with the employers up to, say, the next Labour Government and then an attempt speedily to nationalise the basic industries of the country as a means towards Socialism. Surely the perspective that is opened up by the new policy of the General Council is that Socialism is a distant ideal having little relation to the real facts of life and that the best we can do is to recognise that for the next generation at least the most fruitful results are to be gained by co-operating with the employers. In other words, all the time and energy of the trade unions has to be devoted to training their administrators for co-operating with the capitalists rather than both locally and nationally to training them for the overthrow of the capitalist class.

From *The Fruits of Mondism*, by 'Trade Unionist', August, 1928.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"THE EMPIRE"

WILLIAM GALLACHER

FIFTY years ago, when the Boer War had finally been brought to an end, the Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, then Colonial Secretary, went on a visit to South Africa. On his return he spoke at a great Tory gathering in St. Andrew's Hall, Glasgow. In the course of his speech he said he had gone out one evening and gazed up at the starry heavens, millions of worlds whirling through space. He went on: 'Then I looked away across the illimitable veldt and I had a vision—a vision of Empire'. What a tale he thus gave them, of untold wealth, of trade to revive Britain's decaying industries, of work and wages, of prosperity for all, rich and poor alike. Yes, sir, he had a vision all right.

A year or so later I was standing on a platform at a street corner in Paisley, looking down at an array of pamphlets spread out for display in front of the platform. Prominent amongst them was one with the title *Empire is Murder*. Pride of Empire was inculcated everywhere, it was then much more the subject of laudation than the monarchy. 'The greatest Empire the world has ever seen.' 'An Empire on which the sun never sets.' It was all over the world to the farthest corner of the earth. In school the children had their young minds directed to the bright red areas when geography was the lesson for the day. There are red areas now, that at all costs their young minds must be kept away from or poisoned about their character. But in these earlier days there was no question about the fact of Empire nor of the wealth it brought in an ever-increasing flow into this country—but, however it was disbursed, the poor still remained poor. Nor was there any question as to the attitude of Socialists towards it. They recognised the slavery, the wholesale debauchery of tribes and peoples, that accompanied the boast and the ruthless exploitation, of Empire. Today a change has taken place. Not in the fact of Empire, nor in the ruthless desire of the imperialists for the plunder it represents, but in their public utterances regarding its existence. Now, when the pamphlet to which I have referred should have its title changed to 'Empire is massacre,' the imperialists and their right-wing labour apologists never cease in their efforts to persuade the working class that 'Empire is a thing of the past'. 'There is no British imperialism any more.' So far as colonial peoples are concerned we are just kind-hearted big brothers doing all we can to help backward peoples to a better life —if not in this world in the next.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With all this going on in the press and on the platform, it is scarcely to be wondered at that there is confusion, widespread confusion on the subject and that so many workers should fail to realise the vital importance for themselves of an alliance between the exploited workers of this country and the oppressed and exploited workers and peasants of the colonial and semi-colonial countries. Tearing aside this veil of confusion that seeks to hide the Empire and its evil consequences, not only for the colonial people, but now more and more for the people of this country, has come a truly great study of imperialism, a searching factual study from its rise out of early colonialism to its present-day savage and murderous decline, in *The Crisis of Britain and the British Empire*, by R. Palme Dutt.* If only this book could be the subject of study in every workshop! And why not? This is a matter of life and death for the British workers. Colonial people are dying in the struggle for freedom and independence. The same struggle the Irish people have carried forward century after century and which has still to be completed through the removal of partition.

Yes, colonial people are dying and young lads from Britain are dying in these far off lands, but the imperialism for which they are dying is also dying, but in its death throes it can destroy all that the workers of this country have struggled so hard to achieve in years gone by. With the boast of empire went the self-satisfied bourgeois boast 'This is the wealthiest country in the world'. Can anyone say that today, with Churchill, Butler, O'Brien and others making their doleful speeches of national bankruptcy, unless the workers put their last ounce of energy into the job. We aren't going upwards, despite all the great technical and scientific advances. We're going downward, downward towards ruin and this downward process, this crisis, is inseparable from the 'Crisis of Empire'.

So this book must be made the subject of widespread study. Every page is alive with lessons for the people of this, and of other countries, and particularly for the people of America, from where the more strident imperialists are systematically pushing their way into what hitherto were the profitable reserves of Britain. R. Palme Dutt is recognised throughout the international working-class movement as a master of Marxist theory and practice. And he demonstrates this to the full in his treatment of this great and far-reaching subject. As he says on page 26, 'The crisis of empire cannot be side-stepped. The peoples of Britain and Western Europe are faced with the inescapable necessity to build their lives anew,

* Lawrence & Wishart, 512 pp. 25s.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and to carry through a radical reconstruction of their own countries and of their relations with the present dependent peoples of their empires in such a way as to break once and for all with the old rotten parasitic basis of imperialist domination and exploitation'.

How can they 'build their lives anew' unless they understand the nature of the problem and the character of the forces arrayed against them? The answer is given in chapter after chapter, tracing every stage in the growth of imperialism and of its first mighty crash in 1914, with the emergence of the new, great liberating forces in the October Revolution of 1917. Now, as Dutt says on page 27, 'From Prague to Peking a new world has come into being which has freed itself from the orbit of imperialism'. Do we rise with the new world or sink down in ruin and decay with the old? Surely an important question for the workers everywhere. No more imperialism, croak the right-wing labour leaders. I would just refer workers to a table on page 56. It gives the capital and profits of seven big colonial monopolies for 1951: Capital £1,115 million; Profit £468.4 million or a percentage of profit to capital assets of 42 per cent. That represents wholesale robbery. It goes on in Malaya, it goes on in Africa, in the Sudan, and until a short time ago in Persia. It goes on wherever the big financiers can get control of helpless exploitable people and soldiers to shoot and labour leaders to cover up. Consider those profits (and that's only seven of a multitude of exploiters) and then take the appalling condition of Jamaica, one of the oldest British colonies (as described on page 64). There you have in two striking illustrations the greed and the curse of imperialism. Millions for the parasitic monopolies, misery and starvation for the colonial people.

In a chapter on 'Crisis of the Colonial System,' he deals with the rise of the colonial freedom movement, the wars in South-East Asia, the war in Malaya, the bankruptcy of Western imperialism. Then he opens a chapter entitled 'New Dreams of Empire! Africa,' thus:

> The ageing lion of British imperialism, with its ancient prey in Asia escaping from its jaws, and its hold on the Middle East growing daily more precarious, turns increasingly to Africa for its final hopes of rejuvenation to build there its new main base of empire, exploitation and power. But even there it finds 'another lion' in the field—or rather, an eagle with powerful talons and even there the storm of popular unrest and rising revolt spreads with lightning speed.

He goes on to show that the imperialists with the full backing of the right-wing labour leaders hope to find this great continent an 'Eldorado' rich with plunder. But the peoples of Africa despite

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terror and bombing planes will end this dream as the Liberation forces have ended the American dream of conquest in China.

In this period of rapidly declining imperialism with the colonial peoples battling for freedom with supreme courage and resolute determination, the right-wing labour leaders sank right down to the lowest depths in their attempts to cover up and justify the robbery and terror that is being practised with ever increasing ferocity. The chapter on 'Labour and Empire' will be a revelation to members of the Labour Party. Morrison's utterly shameless grovelling (page 334): 'We are great friends of the jolly old empire and are going to stick it' is indicative of the deserter from the camp of socialism. I was going to say that this was a great chapter, but every chapter is of the same high standard. I have never read a book that shows such wide and deep study. Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin, provide some really priceless quotations. Then there are quotations from the press, from British and American politicians, from a whole range of publications, all carefully fitted in to bring out and emphasise the lesson the workers of this country, of Western Europe and America must learn. That lesson is hammered home in the final chapter, 'The Future of Britain and the British Empire'. Discussing the crisis in Britain he says:

> The petition in bankruptcy of the old imperialist order was filed by the British Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, in Parliament, on July 30, 1952, when he said: 'Tragic indeed is the spectacle of the might, majesty, dominion and power of the once magnificent and still considerable British Empire having to worry and wonder how we can pay the monthly bills. I am tortured by this thought'. This was in truth the confession of bankruptcy of the old imperialist order.

And America, old Churchill might have added, was the grasping, insatiable creditor. And what is the way out of the crisis and out of the curse of imperialist exploitation? Here is the answer:

> By their united exertions and actions, by building up a mighty popular alliance, with the working class in the leadership, for the aims of peace, national independence and economic and social change, they can not only save themselves. They can also hasten the liberation of all the peoples of the Empire over one-quarter of the world. They can turn the balance in favour of world peace and world socialism.

This book can mark a turning point in the history and in the policy of the British labour movement, away from the shoddy, second-hand imperialism of the petty-bourgeoisie right wing towards the great and goodly goal of socialism and an end forever to imperialist exploitation and the hunger and misery it carries in its train.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Reviews

CHINA

China Stands Up, by R. K. Karanjia (People's Publishing House, Ltd., Bombay. 256 pp. *10s. 6d.*).

THE author, a journalist and President of the India-China Friendship Association, visited China in September-October, 1951, as Deputy Leader of the first India Goodwill Mission. Coming from a country where, as he says, conditions today are very like those in China yesterday, he and his colleagues found tremendous inspiration in the way the Chinese had broken from the dark prison of imperialism and Chiang Kai-Shek slavery into the brilliant sunshine of liberation. As his party flew to Rangoon, Singapore, Bangkok, and Hongkong he felt keenly that 'Peking beckons Asia' and that 'in the Chinese people's victory and the liberation of a third of humanity, Asia had found its soul.'

The volume reflects the thrill of discovery not only of *what* China has accomplished but *how* she has done it. 'The immediate overall effect of the new régime, the new Constitution and the Common Programme, was to mobilise the entire sub-continent that was never before a state, a nation or a people, in any modern conception of the words, into one single, organic, indivisible and invincible unity.' Mr. Karanjia finds the secret of this invincible unity in the leadership given by the Chairman Mao Tse-tung and the Chinese Communist Party, the more than 400 million sturdy peasants liberated from the yoke of feudalism, the factory workers who now help to run their own factories, the industrialists who can now do business freed from corruption and bribery, the women no longer shackled with bound feet, the former criminals now becoming useful self-respecting citizens. He explains how inflation and soaring prices were overcome in *four months*, famine has been conquered, the flood menace nearly eliminated, industrialisation is being achieved.

The book provides enjoyment and instruction by its lively reportage. The same warm, friendly Chinese people, met by a party of us in China last autumn, emerge from its pages. Although the visit was in 1951 the book is not dated except for certain production figures which have since been greatly surpassed. Evidence which we saw a year later proved time and again the truth of the author's main conclusion that New China is now an invincible unit.

VIRGINIA PENN.

LOMONOSOV

Russia's Lomonosov — Chemist, Courtier, Physicist, Poet by Boris N. Menshutkin. (208 pp. Princeton University Press. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege. *25s.*).

THE first half of the eighteenth century was a period of considerable intellectual activity in Russia. Under the influence of Peter I contacts had been established with cultural centres in other parts of Europe and scholars of distinction had been attracted to work in the Academy of Sciences which had been founded in St. Petersburg in 1724. To a junior post in the Physics Department of this Academy came, in 1741, a young man who was to dominate the St. Petersburg intellectual horizon for the next quarter of a century and whose genius has been fully appreciated only in our own time. Born of peasant stock in a little fishing com-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

munity on the shores of the White Sea, Lomonosov's thirst for knowledge and spirit of adventure had already led him to Germany where he had become acquainted with the new science of chemistry and its applications to metallurgy.

Lomonosov enriched many branches of science. He discarded old mystical concepts of weightless fluids like phlogiston which continued to hold back the development of chemistry in the west until finally swept away by the work of Lavoisier many years after Lomonosov. A thorough-going atomist, he recognised the connection between heat and molecular motion fully a century before the ideas of the kinetic theory of gases and the mechanical equivalent of heat became generally accepted. As meteorologist, geographer, and grammarian, Lomonosov won fame no less than as a playwright, poet and artist. He also had progressive ideas about the teaching of science and at the Academy in St. Petersburg he established in 1749 the first chemistry laboratory for teaching purposes. It was not until eighty years later that similar laboratories were established in other countries.

Lomonosov was at least a century ahead of his time. When he died he left no school behind to carry on his work. His technical ideas were too advanced to find ready application in eighteenth century Russia. His own attempt to establish an industry for the manufacture of coloured glass failed and caused him acute financial embarrassment. But thanks in a large measure to the patient researches of the author of this book the great genius of Lomonosov is now recognised throughout the Soviet Union and increasingly his achievements are becoming known throughout the world.

One of the most enduring of the monuments to the work of Lomonosov is the Moscow University in the establishment of which he played a major part. The great new University that dominates the Moscow horizon is fittingly named after Lomonosov and is perhaps symbolic of the way his great mind towered above the intellectual horizon of eighteenth century Russia.

It is to be hoped that the present book, written in an interesting and readable style, will lead to a wider appreciation of his work in the English speaking world.

E. H. S. BURHOP.

GREECE

Defiant People, by Paul Hogarth. (42 pp. Lawrence & Wishart. *6s.*).

'THE pictorial conscience of mankind'. Thus does Paul Hogarth describe the function of an artist and with these fifty drawings he does indeed fulfil this role. For he shows us Greece in its entirety, not only in the figure of the beggar, or the worker, or the old woman, or the trade unionist, but in its seaports, the sun, its pagan heritage. Greece groaning beneath oppression and Greece fighting for liberty in the persons of Tony Ambatielos and his fellow trade unionists. For it is in the drawings of the trial of these men that this book reaches its climax. In a powerful and burning introduction James Aldridge aptly comments:

> Here the antagonisms come to light. Take a look at Ambatielos and his mother, and then look at the faces of the military tribunal who sit in judgment on them. These military faces are absolutely right, and more than any other drawing this small view of the half-dozen military fascists shows you the sort of brutes the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Greek people must deal with. Ambatielos and his mother and his fellow trade unionists have already dealt with them, just as Dimitrov once dealt with Goering. Soon history will also deal with them, as it dealt with Goering. In fact you know, after looking at these drawings, who the ultimate victors will be.

These are fighting drawings, combining high artistic quality and greatness of purpose. All who value liberty should get this book and see that it is circulated. Paul Hogarth has done his job. Now it is up to you.

R. T. F. TURNER.

Shorter Notices

Political Studies. Vol. 1 No. 1. February, 1953. (96 pp. *10s. 6d.*)

THE Political Studies Association of the United Kingdom (the association of academic political theorists), has decided to launch a new journal. Its keynote is academic, but it is unashamedly tendentious. So Sir Ernest Barker tells us that since the days of Hooker there have been three schools of English political thought, the Natural Law school, the Utilitarians and the Oxford Idealists, Marxists and Socialists obviously never having existed; and Mr. G. D. H. Cole surpasses all his predecessors with this gem 'British Socialism grew up as a non-Marxist demand for social justice, with the Sermon on the Mount, rather than *Das Kapital* or the *Communist Manifesto*, as its ultimate court of appeal'. So at last equipped with the knowledge of why Transport House behaves as it does the reader may pass on to a discussion of the Classification of Administrative Bodies and other interesting topics.

S.E.

SCIENCE AND SOCIETY

ESTABLISHED 1936

Volume XVII, Number 3

Summer, 1953

Consciousness and Practice in Rational Psychotherapy
Zalman Behr

* * *

The Crisis in Physics
Hans Freistadt

* * *

Classes and Class Struggles During the French Revolution
Albert Soboul

* * *

Utopias Yesterday and Today
A. L. Morton

* * *

Book Reviews by
Mario Bunge,
Stephen F. Mason,
W. E. B. DuBois,
Lester Cole,
Christopher Hill,
Harvey Goldberg,
Samuel Bernstein

* * *

Quarterly, 50 cents Single Copy
(75 cents foreign)
$2.00 per year ($2.50 foreign)

SCIENCE & SOCIETY, Inc.
30, East 20th St., New York 3, N.Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United Nations P.O.W.'s in Korea, Chinese People's Committee for World Peace. (92 pp. Collet's. *1s.*).

IN contrast to the killings in the prison camps by Syngman Rhee and the American authorities, the Korean and Chinese forces treat the captured officers and men with humane care. In Koje Island and elsewhere the Geneva Conventions have been trampled upon, but the British and other United Nations prisoners of war have been treated as though they were friends. This is demonstrated by this 92 pages of text and photograph, all at the extraordinarily cheap price of one shilling.

CONTENTS OF PREVIOUS NUMBERS IN 1953

JANUARY: *Twenty Years On*, R.P.D.; *Trade Unionism in* 1953, Peter Kerrigan; *Africa in Ferment*, Desmond Buckle; *Impressions of China: New Democracy*, Benjamin Farrington; *The Forrestal Diaries*, D. N. Pritt, Q.C.; *People's Democracy in Countries of the East, I*; BOOK REVIEWS: *Introduction to Marxism* (Emile Burns); *Readers' Guide to the Marxist Classics; China Today* (Sundar Lal) reviewed by James Klugmann, W. J. Ellerby; *Drawings*, Mazzullo.

FEBRUARY: *Churchill, Eisenhower and Britain*, R.P.D.; *The Geneva Convention*, 1949, J. Platts-Mills; *At Vienna I Saw Peace*, Jean-Paul Sartre; *The Rents Offensive*, Katherine Hood; *People's Democracy in Countries of the East, II*; *A New Town in Poland*, George Bidwell; BOOK REVIEWS: *U.S. Foreign Policy* (Walter Lippmann); *The Critical Years* (G. Von Schweppenburg); *Economics of Peace and War* (John Eaton); *Plot Against Peace* (Ivor Montagu); reviewed by Andrew Rothstein, Henry Purcell, Stanley Evans.

MARCH: (Marx 70th Anniversary Number): *Marxism After 70 Years*, R.P.D.; *The Great Discussion*, George Matthews; *On a U.S. Ambassador*, Karl Marx; *Zionism*, Andrew Rothstein; *Impressions of China: Education*, Benjamin Farrington; *Trials and the Press*, Pat Sloan; *People's Democracy in Countries of the East, III*; *Facsimile*: The Minutes of the First International, May 23, 1871.

APRIL (Stalin Memorial Number): *Stalin and the Future*, R.P.D.; *Tributes to Stalin*, I J. Nehru, II D. N. Pritt, Q.C., III William Gallacher; *Stalin's Legacy*, James Klugmann; *The General Strike*, 1926, J. V. Stalin; *Mr. Eden Kow-Tows*, Quæstor; *Cold War Against Britain*, Cmdr. E. P. Young, R.N. (Ret'd.); BOOK REVIEWS: *America Over Britain* (P. Bolsover); *Brother Bill McKie*, (Philip Bonsky); *Quakers Visit Russia* (Kathleen Lonsdale, F.R.S.); *England in the Late Middle Ages* (A. R. Myers); *England in the 17th Century* (M. Ashley); reviewed by J. B. Figgins, W. Gallacher, A.R., L. F. Marks, A.L.M.

MAY: *D-Day for Peace*, R.P.D.; *May Day and the Fight for Peace*, J. B. Figgins; *Calendar of Peace Moves*, Quæstor; *Francois Rabelais*, T. A. Jackson; *Violence in America*, George Hardy; *An Epic Story*, William Gallacher; *The General Strike*, 1926 (II), J. V. Stalin; BOOK REVIEWS: *That's Why I Went* (Monica Felton); *Betrayed Spring* (Jack Lindsay); *Problems of Nationalized Industry* (W. A. Robson); *Rumanian Summer* (J. Lindsay and M. Cornforth); *Not Like This* (Jane Walsh); *Sociology of Communism* (J. Monnerot); reviewed by D. N. Pritt, Q.C., J. Mahon, W. Hannington, P.J.W., B. Marks, T.A.J.

JUNE: *Britain's Hour*, R.P.D.; *Africa, Africa!* Derek Kartun; *On The Razor's Edge*, Ivor Montagu; *Does Peace Mean Slump?* John Eaton; *An Old Superstition, A New Disgrace*, William Morris; *Churches in Eastern Europe*, Rev. Stanley Evans. BOOK REVIEWS: *History of The Times Vol. IV*; *China's New Creative Age* (Hewlett Johnson); *Koje Unscreened* (Burchett & Winnington); *The Revolutionary Movement in France* (J. Plamenatz); reviewed by R.P.D., Monica Felton, D. N. Pritt, Q.C.; H.R.J.

JULY: *The New Labour Programme*, R.P.D.; *Sir Lincoln Evans and All That*, Wal Hannington; *The Artist and the Working-Class Movement*, Paul Hogarth; *Calendar of War or Peace*, Quæstor; *Open Letter to My M.P.*, Andrew Condron (Royal Marines); *McCarthyism in Britain?* Christopher Meredith; BOOK REVIEWS: *Who Killed Kenya?* (C. Willis); *Gold Coast Revolution* (G. Padmore); *Children in the British Colonies*; *Solo Trumpet* (T. A. Jackson); *The Volunteers* (Steve Nelson); reviewed by Desmond Buckle; Bob Stewart; E. Edney.

The discussion on the Labour Party's new programme, dealt with by J. B. Figgins on page 350, was initiated in the Notes of the Month of the July issue, of which there are still a few copies available.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not from the executive'. A Londoner declares it 'puny' and considers that, in the main, it 'prostrates itself before its taskmaster, America'. Another says emphatically that 'this document is a complete challenge to last year's conference, and is being torn limb from limb by local parties'. Many point out how completely home policy depends on foreign policy; and, above all, that all hangs on how vigorously the initiative is taken by Labour to seize the opportunities of forcing peace on those who would wreck it. There are, indeed, many danger signals—but what must hearten the movement is the hard thinking and lively discussion going on. What Britain needs so urgently is a fearless Socialist policy that can unite all sections and give rise to an enthusiastic will to victory. All loyal workers for Socialism need to fight for it, everywhere, in the conviction that nothing less than a real Socialist programme can save Britain and peace, in the same spirit that the pioneers like William Morris showed when the enemy was infinitely stronger. And how invigorating it is to meet that spirit, in young and old! Our readers will indeed respond warmly to *A Veteran's Voice* by Florence Mattison.

We have been working overtime fulfilling the requests for specimen copies of *Labour Monthly* to be sent to friends and acquaintances, especially for R.P.D.'s analysis of the Labour Party programme in July. Readers often complain that having to cut out the specimen copy form on the back cover spoils their copy for binding: must it be used? Well, it helps us if the coupon is used, and those who send it get first call on strictly limited supplies; but we will try to comply with readers' requests in any form.

No space to tell about interesting letters with donations; but special thanks to 'Old Sweat', who sent 'a small reward for printing Marine Condron's letter'. 'As an old soldier I know what it is to defy authority.' And warm thanks, too, to the group of Scots who always pay theirs three months ahead at the first holiday month: and also to the 'Manchester O.A.P., 81 years young', who sends 5s., 'a small item from my holiday money. I only wish I could make it pounds'. Best holiday wishes to one and all.

£32 4s. 7d.

STAND-IN MONEY came from: 'Bath', standing-in for Aylesbury, Pontypridd, Totnes, Warwick and Watford, 10s.; 'Billie', standing-in for Tonypandy, 'in memory of Lewis Jones', 1s.

STEADY MONEY came from: 'Cardiff', £1 0s. 6d.; 'Cambridge Seniors', £1 10s.; 'Bath', 10s.; Anon 'Whitchurch', 1s.; P. O'H., 'Dublin', 2s.; C.B., 'Bristol', 3s.; J.H., 'Ipswich', 5s.; 'Personal Greetings from U.S.A.', (1st instalment) £5; 'Chicago', (pre-paid); J.F. 'Aberdeen', (pre-paid); A.G., 'Arbroath', (pre-paid); 'New York', (pre-paid); 'Jon', 10s.; 'Overseas Airman', 5s.; 'Red Sergeant', 2s. 6d.; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; H.G.B., 2s.; E. D. McCallum, 10s.; D. Rees, £1; J. Macdonald, 5s. 6d.; D. M. Clarke, 10s.; M. Philibert, 10s.; Royston Green, 3s. 6d.; R.F.B., £3; The Humphreys Family, 4s.; 'L'Humanite', 3s.; D. H. Strathern and Friends, £1; Bob Waters, 3s.; H. Tinkler, 5s.; S. Morrissy, 10s.; O. Greene, £2; R. McLeod, 10s.; E.J.B., 10s.; P. N. Brinson, 10s.; J. A. Purton, 7s. 6d.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: E.R.M., 'in memory of the Rosenbergs' 19s.; H. Ronald, 2s.; T. D. Culbert, 2s.; J. E. Hilton, 2s.; E. Williams, 2s.; A. Idle, 12s.; D. J. Holman, 12s.; G.R.H., 1s.; D. Goodfellow, 2s.; J. McLanachan, 2s.; T. Graham, 6s.; F. M. Roy, 2s.; A. S. Dopson, 2s.; C.K.W. (Hong Kong) 1s.; W. J. Sell, 2s.; W. H. Miller, 7s.; N. Ratcliffe, 2s. 6d.; A. Clout, 10s.; B. H. Steel, 12s.; J. G. Barker, 2s.; G.S., 'Orpington', 10s.; J. Hanna, 5s.; E. Harper, 2s.; D. R. Morgan, 10s.; C. G. Taff, 2s.; V. S. McL. (Canada), 10s. 7d.; W.V.S., (Canada), 7s.; S. A. F. Murrell, 1s.; H. F. Westney, 12s.; D. Walker, 5s.; J. C. (U.S.A.) 14s.

Our thanks to you all.

Co-op No.: L99482.

ANGELA TUCKETT,
134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY NOT BY POST?

Here's the Subscription Form:

NAME.....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

.....

I wish to become a postal subscriber and enclose 18s. (home) $3.00 (U.S.A. and Canada), 19s. (elsewhere) for a year, beginning with the.....issue.

(SIGNED).....

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

Labour Monthly Bound Volume 1952

It's a history of the year and a permanent record

ORDER NOW

From your usual newsagents price **£1 5s. 0d.**, or

THE MANAGER
134, BALLARDS LANE
LONDON, N.3

NATIONAL GUARDIAN

The Progressive Newsweekly

Authoritative voice of the American progressive movement

Edited by CEDRIC BELFRAGE

Annual Subscription 24s.

ORDER FROM COLLET'S
40, GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.1.

LABOUR RESEARCH

August issue includes:
"Transport Report"
"Steel Profits"
"Miss Horsbrugh Under Fire"

Monthly 9d.; p.a., 10s. 6d.

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
2, Soho Square, London, W.1.

FOR SPECIMEN COPIES

Please send a free specimen copy to:—

(1) Name .....
Address.....

(2) Name .....
Address.....

You may mention my name, or/I enclose note to be sent on.

Signed.....
Address .....
.....

TO THE MANAGER, 134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED